

Paolo Asso
A Commentary on Lucan, *De bello civili* IV

TEXTE UND KOMMENTARE

Eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe

Herausgegeben von

Siegmar Döpp, Adolf Köhnken, Ruth Scodel

Band 33

De Gruyter

A Commentary on
Lucan, *De bello civili* IV

Introduction, Edition, and Translation

by

Paolo Asso

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-020385-1
e-ISBN 978-3-11-021651-6
ISSN 0563-3087

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Asso, Paolo, 1965-

A commentary on Lucan, "De bello civili IV" : introduction, edition, and translation /
by Paolo Asso.

p. cm. -- (Texte und Kommentare : eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe ; Bd. 33)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-11-020385-1 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Lucan, 39-65. Pharsalia. Liber 4. 2. Rome--History--Civil War, 49-45 B.C.--
Literature and the war. 3. Epic poetry, Latin--History and criticism. 4. Caesar, Julius--
In literature. I. Lucan, 39-65. Pharsalia. Liber 4. English & Latin. II. Title.

PA6480.A87 2009

873'.01--dc22

2009050252

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet
at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2010 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/New York

Typesetting: Michael Peschke, Berlin

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

MATRI PATRIQVE AMATISSIMIS

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	IX
Note to Readers.....	X
Introduction	
I. Lucan's life and times: <i>Vitae</i> and other evidence.....	2
II. Lucan's 'antiphrastic' epos.....	10
Book IV and its place in the poem	14
III. Language and Style	18
Diction	19
Syntax and word order.....	24
Rhetorical devices	25
Meter	30
IV. Note on the Latin Text.....	33
Conspectus siglorum	36
Text and Translation	38
Commentary	
Part I: The Battle of Ilerda 1–401	100
1–23 Caesar's arrival at Ilerda.....	104
24–147 Skirmish at the Hillock and Caesarians in the Storm	116
148–253 Fraternizing.....	144
254–336 Pompeians in Trouble.....	166
337–401 Pardon.....	181

Part II: Mutual suicide: Volteius and the Opitergians 402–581	189
Part III: Curio in Africa 581–824	213
581–8 From Vulteius' aristeia in Illyricum to Curio's arrival in Africa.....	213
4.589–660 Hercules and Antaeus	220
4.661–714 Curio defeats Varus	247
4.715–98 Curio and his army surprised and annihilated by King Juba.....	265
4.799–824 The final apostrophe	284
References and Abbreviations	295
Index locorum notabiliorum potiorumque	321
Index nominum et rerum	331

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to the institutions that supported my work: Princeton University, Swarthmore College, Kenyon College, the Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, and especially my home institution, the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

Among all the individuals who offered their advice and feedback, I should mention Nicholas Horsfall and my mentors, Enrico Flores, Denis C. Feeney, Robert A. Kaster, and R. Elaine Fantham.

Last and by no means least I want to express my heartfelt gratitude to my students Perot Bissel, Martin Halprin, Colin Keiffer, and Michael McOsker, and to my colleagues J. Mira Seo, Ruth Scodel, and Frederick F. Wherry.

Note to Readers

In referring to Lucan's poem, whose title for us is *Bellum Ciuile*,¹ the abbreviation *BC* is adopted. The text of Book IV has been established for the present edition on the basis of Housman 1927.²

In the lemmata and the Latin text there is no graphic distinction between consonantal and vocalic *u*, but the remaining Latin quotations follow the practice adopted in the editions of the individual authors as reproduced in the Packard Humanities Institute database of Latin texts.

The names and titles of works of ancient authors are abbreviated according to the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd ed., 1996), with occasional variations. Editions of fragmentary texts are identified by editor name following the fragment number.

Works by modern authors, including translations as well as editions of fragmentary ancient texts, are cited by abbreviation. All abbreviated references and citations, including grammars, encyclopedias and lexica, are listed at the end in the comprehensive list 'References and Abbreviations.'

1 On the poem's title, see the remarks and the discussion cited in Shackleton Bailey 1988, iii.

2 See the 'Note on the Latin Text' on 33-5 below.

Introduction

I. Lucan's life and times: *Vitae* and other evidence

The extant information on Lucan's short life is of ancient date and not especially scarce. The earliest sources are Statius, Martial, and Cassius Dio,¹ against which we need to evaluate what we learn from three biographies (*Vitae*). The earliest one of these is attributed to Suetonius,² the second to an otherwise unknown Vacca, a 6th century grammarian, and the third is anonymous and undated, but seems to depend to a large extent on the Suetonian life. The most reliable details reported in the three *Vitae* are those that we can match with the sparse information we find in other ancient authors.³

The facts are known and somewhat over-interpreted, but they bear repeating.⁴ Marcus Annaeus Lucanus (henceforth L.) was born in Corduba, capital of Hispania Baetica, on November 3, CE 39, to a prominent family of Italian stock.⁵ L. received his *cognomen* from his maternal grandfather, Acilius Lucanus, for his mother was Acilia,⁶ descendant from the illustrious local family,⁷ as confirmed by the inscriptions bearing the names of various Acilii that surfaced in some Spanish towns of Baetica and Lusitania.⁸ L.'s father was M. Annaeus

1 St. *Silvae* 2.7; Mart. *Epigr.* 7.21-3, 10.64; Tac. *Ann.* 15.49, 56, 70; Dio 57.29.4.

2 The Suetonian authorship is confirmed by the similarity in phrasing with Jerome's excerpts in *Chron.* ad Ol. 210.3 (mistakenly referred to 65 instead of 63 CE): *M. Annaeus Lucanus Cordubensis poeta in Pisoniana coniuratione deprehensus, brachium ad secandas uenas medico praebuilt* (see Gagliardi 1989, 13); which very closely corresponds with the Suetonian life, 401.31-2 *Badali brachia ad secandas uenas praebuilt medico*.

3 Notably, Statius, Martial, Tacitus, Petronius, Fronto. Still valuable is Heitland's discussion of Lucan's biography and its sources found in Haskins 1887, xiii-xx; see also Wuilleumier/Le Bonniec 1962, 1-3; Marx in *RE* I.2.2226-36.

4 My extensive debts to scholars will be dutifully noted infra. Elaine Fantham's chapter 'A Controversial Life,' which will open the forthcoming *Brill Companion to Lucan*, constitutes yet one more milestone in the continuing debate.

5 Vacca *Vita Lucani* 402.14-16 *Badali natus est III Nonas Nouembris C. Caesare Germanico II L. Apronio Caesiano coss.*

6 *RE* I.1.259 Nr. 59.

7 Roman colonists of prominent families were settled on the site of Corduba on the river Baetis (= Guadalquivir) by the consul M. Claudius Marcellus in 152 BCE; see Strabo 3.2.1; Griffin 1972, 17-19; Heitland 1887, xxiii.

8 The Acilii in *CIL* II 2016-20 are from Singili[a] Barba (= modern El Castillon) not far from Anticaria (= modern Antequera) in Baetica (*Barr. Atlas* 26F4-27A4); *CIL* II 2234

Mela, youngest child of the rhetorician L. Annaeus Seneca the Elder and younger brother of the famous tragic poet and Stoic philosopher L. Annaeus Seneca the Younger. The Elder Seneca's oldest child was L. Annaeus Novatus, to whom Seneca dedicated two of his philosophical treatises.⁹

Scholars tend to agree that the Annaei were constantly engaged in what we would term 'continuing their education', and the family atmosphere of learning exerted a great influence on the poet. Taken to Rome as an infant of barely eight months, L. was brought up in high circles, receiving his education first and foremost from the members of his extended family. The Stoic philosopher, grammarian and rhetorician, L. Annaeus Cornutus was probably among L.'s teachers.¹⁰ In his consolation for his own exile addressed to his mother Helvia, Seneca singles out the little Marcus Annaeus Lucanus among his mother's grandchildren as surely a source of incessant joy:

Look at your grandchildren: Marcus, the greatest source of joy (*blandissimum puerum*), in whose presence no sadness may last. No one's heart can be afflicted by any sorrow so great or so recent that Marcus' embrace would not soothe.¹¹

The emperor Claudius exiled L.'s uncle for alleged adultery with Julia Livilla (daughter of Germanicus and sister of the emperor Gaius Caligula), but the actual motivation was probably of a political nature and

is from Corduba itself (*Barr. Atlas* 26F4), whereas 2188 is from Sacili, also in Baetica; 3840 and 3871 are from Saguntum (*Barr. Atlas* 27E2); see *RE* I.1.259 s.v. Acilius Nr. 53. The prominence of the Annaei is also attested in epigraphic sources; see the index of gens names in *CIL* II s.v. 'Annaei, Annei, Annii, etc.'; for the variant spellings, see *RE* I.2.2225.3-7.

- 9 The three books *De ira* and the *De vita beata*; Duff 1960, 170-1. Novatus was adopted by the rhetorician L. Junius Gallio and changed his name to Junius Annaeus Gallio. Under emperor Claudius he became proconsul of the newly constituted senatorial province of Achaia. During his tenure of office (in CE 53) he dismissed the charge brought by the Jews against the apostle Paul (*Acts* xviii).
- 10 *OCD* 94; Nock in *RE Suppl.* 5.995 thinks that Cornutus might have been one of L.'s father's freedmen; cf. Mayer 1982, 316. Probus *Vita Persii* 5; [Persius] *cognovit per Cornutum etiam Annaeum Lucanum, aequaeuum auditorem Cornuti*.
- 11 Sen. *Ad Helv.* 18.4-5 *ad nepotes quoque respice: Marcum blandissimum puerum, ad cuius conspectum nulla potest durare tristitia; nihil tam magnum, nihil tam recens in cuiusquam pectore furit quod non circumfusus ille permulceat*. Some assumed that the Marcus in question was one of Seneca's own sons (e.g., Kamp 1933), but scholars now tend to identify him with Lucan; e.g., Griffin 1976, 58-9; Gagliardi 1976, 21; Duff 1960, 238; Cazzaniga 1955, 3.

aimed at striking the opposition gathered around Germanicus' closest relatives.¹² The Annaei seem to have been supporters of the Republic. The socio-political import of the alleged Republican fervor of the Annaei is very hard to establish, but the information we find in the two Senecan corpora may either have arisen the unwarranted tradition of the family's Republican sympathy or faithfully preserved indubitable traces of dissent.

In dedicating his *Controversiae* to his elder son Novatus, the Elder Seneca regrets not having been able to hear Cicero because the years of civil war terror prevented him from leaving his Spanish hometown to go to Rome.¹³ Clearly, it would be preposterous to claim that the Elder Seneca's caution says anything about his family members' political views. What is certain is that Corduba sided with Pompey during the civil war,¹⁴ which perhaps could explain the Elder Seneca's caution about leaving town in the wake of so many Caesarian successes.

Another Corduba-related fact, which might be seen in relation to the Corduban Republicanism of the Annaei, is that the theme of Civil War had already been expounded in epic by Sextilius Ena, the Corduban poet mentioned in one of L.'s grandfather's *Suasoriae* as reciting a poem on the proscriptions of 43 BCE.¹⁵ Furthermore, in the biography of his father, the Younger Seneca informs us that his father wrote a history of Rome from the inception of the civil wars.¹⁶ It has been suggested that these histories 'started with the wars that killed the Republic, the wars after which truth could be said to have disappeared.'¹⁷ The lone fragment we have of the Younger Seneca's father's biography seems to say that the Younger Seneca published his father's histories, though perhaps they had been left incomplete, for the fragment suggests

12 Conte 1994, 408; Dio 60.8.5; see Griffin 1976, 61.

13 Sen. *Contr* 1.praef.11.

14 Caesar sacked the city in 45 BCE (*Bell. Hisp.* 59-60).

15 Sen. *Suas.* 6.27.

16 Sen. *De Vita Patris* frg. 1 (Peter 1906, HRR II.98) *Si quaecumque composuit pater meus et edi uoluit, iam in manus populi emissem, ad claritatem nominis sui satis sibi ipse prospexerat. [...] quisquis legisset eius historias ab initio bellorum ciuiliū, unde primum ueritas retro abiit, paene usque ad mortis suae diem, magno aestimasset scire, quibus natus esset parentibus ille qui res Roma<nas>...;* after which the palimpsest breaks off.

17 Griffin 1972, 9; for the meaning of *bella ciuilia* in Seneca's fragment from his *De Vita Patris*, see also Peter HRR II, 1906, cxviii.

that the Elder Seneca was writing until the very end of his life. Although the Elder Seneca died when L. was still an infant, it is both plausible and likely that the civil wars were a theme that the Annaei discussed at home, and it is not impossible that L. actually studied his grandfather's historical work.

L. will have been exposed to the historical, scientific, and philosophical interests of his family circle but it is fair to say that his uncle exerted on him the largest influence. L.'s familiarity with Nero was doubtlessly a direct result of uncle Seneca's role as the emperor's preceptor. Recalled from exile in 49 through Agrippina's intervention, who wanted him as her son's teacher, Seneca exerted a beneficial influence on Nero until the young emperor first deposed Burrus in 55 and then succeeded in killing his own mother in 59.¹⁸ All expectations of recovering Nero from lapsing into tyrannical cruelty had vanished with the matricide; and with the death of Afranius Burrus in 62 Seneca's last hopes had most certainly been killed.¹⁹

Crucial years in L.'s life were those between Nero's accession to the Principate in 54 and Burrus' death in 62. Although uncle Seneca never speaks of his nephew, scholars suppose that L. and his uncle spent together the greater part of the last fifteen years of their lives from 49/50 until their execution in 65. The exact chronology of L.'s life and works cannot be reconstructed with any degree of certainty, but the broad lines can be reasonably sketched.

L. was ten years old when his uncle was recalled from exile and barely fifteen when Nero, aged seventeen, became emperor. At some point (presumably in 53, some months before emperor's Claudius' death), L. must have left Rome in order to pursue his studies in Athens, as was customary for elite Roman young men between sixteen and eighteen, and we know that Nero invited him to return to Rome in 55 and join his circle of friends.²⁰ Tacitus explains the kind of activities in which such a circle of friends would engage and depicts the literary types that the emperor enjoyed not only as audience, but as the inspir-

18 Tacitus informs us that Nero's reason in deposing Burrus was the latter's complacency toward Agrippina (*Ann.* 12.42), whose increasingly controlling behavior Nero was no longer willing to endure.

19 Tacitus insinuates that Burrus' illness might have been helped with poison (*Ann.* 14.51).

20 Suet. *Vita Lucani* 400.10-11 *Badali reuocatus Athenis a Nerone, cohortique amicorum additu.*

ing milieu for his own artistic endeavors. Although Tacitus' maliciousness is as impenetrable as entertaining, we gather that the talents Nero selected were yet to be recognized, which suggests the young emperor's need to shine among and outdo the select group of literary and artistic 'peers'.²¹ Nero must have been impressed by the young poet's prolific production.

For shortly after or somewhat around the time he was called from Athens, L. had probably already composed the *Iliacon*, an epic on Hector's death at Troy (allegedly inspired by Nero's speech in favor of the Trojans of CE 53).²² An *Underworld (Catachthonion)*,²³ and perhaps some *Saturnalia* are also to be dated around the time of L.'s arrival to court. We also hear of ten books of *Silvae*, which we can presume to have been similar in generic composition and literary intent to Statius' extant collection, and the *Laudes Neronis*, an encomium for the living emperor that L. especially composed and recited for the Neronia of 60.²⁴

At age twenty-one, the young poet's skill must have been quite developed, if we are to believe that the epyllion *Orpheus* was composed extempore.²⁵ In 60, in other words, L. was already a court poet, and his social stance benefited from the emperor's favor with the special dispensation he received to enter two magistracies, the quaestorship and the augurate, before reaching the minimum legal age of twenty-five.²⁶ Scholars have inferred from the sources that the *Orpheus* was extempore-

21 Tac. *Ann.* 14.16.

22 St. *Silvae* 2.7.54-7 *ac primum teneris adhuc in annis | ludes Hectora Thessalosque currus | et supplex Priami potentis aurum*; cf. Schanz/Hosius 1935, 495; and most recently Newlands 2010 (forthcoming) in Asso 2010 (forthcoming).

23 St. *Silvae* 2.7.57 *et sedis reserabis inferorum*.

24 Tac. *Ann.* 14.20.1; Dio 61.21.1; Suet. *Nero.* 12.3-4; St. *Silvae* 2.7.58-9 *ingratus Nero dulcibus theatri | et noster tibi proferetur Orpheus*. Some scholars identify the *Catachthonion* with the epyllion *Orpheus*.

25 Vacca *Vita Lucani* 404.33-6 *Badali gessit autem quaesturam, in qua cum collegis more tunc usitato munus gladiatorium edidit secundo pupuli fauore; sacerdotium etiam acceperat auguratus* (see Cazzaniga 1955, 10; cf. Ahl 1976, 37). If the practice of avoiding the overlapping of offices was maintained, we should expect that L. held the two offices subsequently rather than contemporaneously, starting from 61 until no later than 64, assuming that the quaestorship was a reward for the *Laudes Neronis*. The magistrates legally took office upon the first day of the year after their election had been secured.

26 E.g., Rose 1966, 381.

rized at the Neronia of 60,²⁷ and we might guess that the incomplete tragedy *Medea* must have been begun somewhat later, along with the first three books of the *Bellum Ciuile*. Finally, the list given by Vacca mentions also fourteen pantomime librettos (*fabulae salticae*), *Epi-grams*, *Letters from Campania*, and *The Great Fire (De Incendio Urbis)*,²⁸ but these are only the works that Vacca could consult in his day.²⁹ The actual number of works, therefore, might have been higher. Vacca does not mention the *Adlocutio ad Pollam* and a libelous poem (*carmen famosum*),³⁰ about which we know from the poetic catalog of L.'s works extant in St. *Silvae* 2.7.54-72.³¹

L.'s productivity and literary output are impressive by any standard, regardless of whether we consider the quality of his work in proportion to his speed of composition. By virtue of his exceptional talent, he so impressed the artistically ambitious emperor as to elicit his jealousy and was thereby banned from public performances. Both Vacca and Suetonius mention, as confirmed also by Tacitus, that the quarrel resulted in the notorious ban.³² Shortly before, L. had published three books of his

27 Vacca *Vita Lucani* 403.39-404.45 Badali *cum inter amicos Caesaris tam conspicuus fieret profectus <eius> [coni. Reiffersheid] in poetica, frequenter ostendebatur; quippe et certamine pentaeterico acto in Pompei theatro laudibus recitatis in Neronem fuerat coronatus et ex tempore Orphea scriptum in experimentum aduersum conplures ediderat poetas et tres libros, quales uidemus.*

28 St. *Silvae* 2.7.60-1 *dices culminibus Remi uagantis | infandos domini nocentis ignis.*

29 Vacca's date has been established as later than the beginning of the 5th century, that is, after the abolition of the gladiatorial games in 404. This has been inferred from Vacca's statement that as quaestor L. gave lavish games *more tunc usitato*, but as has been rightly observed, under Nero it was not customary at all for a quaestor to offer games: 'If Lucan actually gave a gladiatorial show he was doing so of his own free will, not in accordance with normal or required practice. A first century scholar would have known this. [...] Vacca is writing after the total abolition of the gladiatorial games in the sixth consulate of Honorius in 404 and is pointing out to his reader that Lucan was not being wantonly barbarous by giving such a display, but merely conforming to the usual practice of his times' (Ahl 1976, 334).

30 Some scholars avow that the *famosum carmen* (a libelous poem) attributed to L. by Suetonius (*Vita Lucani* 400.19 Badali) was identical with the *De incendio urbis*, composed after the ban, in which L. denounced the crimes of Nero and his entourage, and blamed the emperor for setting Rome on fire; see Narducci 2002, 8, 10; Ahl 1976, 351; Griffin 1984, 182-3.

31 Ahl 1976, 333. The chronology of the early works of L. has been reconstructed by Ahl 1971 (updated in Ahl 1976, 333-53, with a hypothesis on the composition of the BC).

32 See Gresseth 1957; Holmes 1999; Saylor 1999, 546 n. 1; Fantham 1992, 13-14; Conte 1994, 444-5; Ahl 1976, 47-9 and n. 54.

epic ‘as we have them,’ *quales uidemus*, according to Vacca.³³ In fact, the first three books of the *Bellum Ciuile* were composed and published sometime before the ban, which Dio dates at 65.³⁴ The background for the ban is impossible to reconstruct, because the sources only report scant details but they all agree in relating the disagreement to artistic matters, which scholars are often too quick to construe as relating to L.’s revolutionary and anti-imperialistic poetics.³⁵

The quarrel between L. and Nero, as it happens, has preserved for us one of the few fragments of Nero’s poetry: *sub terris tonuisse putes*, ‘you would think that thunder broke out under the earth.’ Suetonius reports these words as uttered by L. in a public latrine while breaking wind gustily. L.’s derisory intent in quoting Nero’s poetry in such a prosaic context is perhaps indicative of the poet’s abrasive personality, and the fact that the sources link the ban with L. joining the conspiracy to replace Nero with Calpurnius Piso should not surprise us. The ban undoubtedly exacerbated L.’s feelings against the emperor. Given how prolific L. was in the short life he lived, the ban on performing and on appearing in public must have been hard to bear for a person with L.’s artistic temperament.

The sources concur in reporting an episode that emphasizes not just Nero’s artistic jealousy, but L.’s own pride and sense of self-worth as an artist, a sentiment that L. surely displayed in his recitations and which can only have worsened his relationship with his powerful friend. Not long before the ban, Nero is reported to have abandoned one of L.’s recitations with the pretext of summoning a senate meeting. Whether historical or not, the excuse of the senate meeting is to be seen not so much as a good excuse, in the sense that important affairs of

33 Vacca *Vita Lucani* 403.39-404.45 Badali, quoted in full at n. 27 above.

34 Dio 62.29.4; Tac. *Ann.* 15.49.3; Gagliardi 1976, 80-5. Rose 1966 constructs an elaborate and detailed chronology for the composition of the *Bellum Ciuile* and concludes that L. had composed at least six books by 65. His argument largely relies on the fact that L. does not sound any angrier against Caesar (and the Principate) in Books 4-6 than he does in 1-3, whereas books 7-9 seem to contain the angriest anti-Caesarian utterances.

35 The extreme in seeing L. as a *Freiheit* poet is represented by Schönberger 1957, Schönberger 1958, and especially Schönberger 1964 (= Schönberger 1970 in Rutz 1970, 525-45). Still speculative but more rigorous in his reliance on the texts, is Gagliardi 1976, 47-66, who sees L.’s ‘revolt against classicism’ within the context of the contemporary trend in oratory and L.’s household inclination to the study of rhetoric.

State call the ruler's attention', but as intended to belittle and somewhat disqualify L.'s poetic talent but putting the poet to his subordinate place. Two *Lives*, Vacca and Suetonius, agree in seeing the senate meeting as Nero's excuse to leave. Whether we understand that Nero was bored by L.'s poetry or that he acted deliberately out of jealousy, the sources are adamant in showing that L. took Nero's leaving as a personal outrage.³⁶ Suetonius, in fact, goes so far as to claim that Lucan joined the Pisonian conspiracy and behaved as its standard-bearer in response to Nero's ban.³⁷ Be that as it may, when the conspiracy was unmasked, L. was ordered to open his veins and his last words seem to have been those spoken by one of his own characters, a soldier who bleeds to death.³⁸ He died on April 30 of the year 65, a few months short of his twenty-sixth birthday.³⁹

36 Gagliardi 1976, 80-5.

37 Suet. *Vita Lucani* 400.19-401.22 *Badali ad extremum paene signifer Pisonianae coniurationis exstitit; ibid. 54-5 dum uindictam expetit, in mortem ruit.*

38 Tac. *Ann.* 15.70.1 *is profluente sanguine ubi frigescere pedes manusque et paulatim ab extremis cedere spiritum feruido adhuc et compote mentis pectore intellegit, recordatus carmen a se compositum quo uulneratum militem per eius modi mortis imaginem obisse tradiderat, uersus ipsos rettulit eaque illi suprema uox fuit.* Scholars have speculated that the lines might have been 3.635-46, i.e., the death of the Massiliote Licydas, as first proposed by Sulpitius, an early editor of Lucan (quoted by Oudendorp 1728), followed by Iustus Lipsius in his commentary on Tacitus' *Annals* (Antwerp 1627; see Köstermann 1968, 320 ad Tac. *Ann.* 15.70.1; Gagliardi 1976, 31 n. 50). An alternative passage is 9.805-14 (a soldier dying from snakebite, e.g., Wick 2004, 2.343-5 ad 9.805-14); but see Hunink 1992b, 238 ad 3.638, on the fact that no passage in the *Bellum Ciuile* exactly matches Tacitus' description; full discussion in Hunink 1992a (in Deroux 1992).

39 Vacca *Vita Lucani* 404.54-405.57 *Badali sua sponte coactus uita excedere uenas sibi praecidit peritque pridie Kal. Maias Attico Vestino et Nerua Silano coss. XXVI aetatis annum agens.* On the basis of the phrasing in Tac. *Ann.* 15.70.1 *exim Annaei Lucani caedem imperat*, R. Tacker takes issue with Vacca's *sua sponte* and argues that L.'s death was staged as an actual execution rather than a forced suicide. The execution was depicted by the Eighteenth century engraver of the title page of Nicholas Rowe's English translation (Rowe 1718), who represented L. 'sitting on the edge of a pool inside a house [...] submitting to three husky men who are opening his veins, while three armed soldiers stand guard and a stern tribune gives orders' (Tucker 1987, 330 and pl. VIII).

II. Lucan's 'antiphrastic' epos

The list of L.'s lost works gives us nothing on the poet's intellectual journey from his first writings to the *BC*. Such a crucial question as 'To what extent does the *BC* break away from L.'s previous production?' can be answered only hypothetically. The most persuasive hypothesis sees the *BC* as a break from the supposedly heavily mythological poetry of the *Iliacon* and the jocose adaptations of mythic materials in the pantomime librettos. One can imagine a first phase in which L. responds to the taste of Nero and the Neronian court for the poetics of entertainment, followed by a second innovative phase, inaugurated by the *BC*, in which the traditional mythological apparatus has been abandoned and an enlightened critique of the Principate is expressed in a style that remains nonetheless attuned to the contemporary taste for highly rhetorical poetry.⁴⁰

Whether we are to view L.'s approach to epic in the *BC* as the result of gradual evolution or as a break from previous experiments, what is certain is that L.'s epic reads as a profoundly innovative response to Virgil's *Aeneid*. An influential reading of the poem considers L.'s *BC* as an anti-*Aeneid*,⁴¹ an intentional break away from the Augustan myth of re-birth and restoration as propounded in the *Aeneid*.⁴² This view is based on a careful scrutiny of L.'s allusive references to Virgil, an imitation/emulation technique that the late Emanuele Narducci felicitously terms 'antiphrastic allusiveness.' This technique relies on a kind of allusivity that repeats the assertions found in the Virgilian model but reverses them by radically subverting the original meaning.⁴³ One memorable example of this technique, that relies on close verbal correspondences as well as L.'s incomparably creative use of rhetorical arti-

40 Cautious reservations against speculative reconstructions are voiced in Narducci 2002, 14, whose equally speculative albeit sound hypothesis, however, is that the *BC* represents a break in the evolution of L.'s poetics. Narducci is reacting against the excessively idealized vision of L. as a poet for freedom, e.g., Gagliardi 1976, 28-9, and Schönberger 1964, 32.

41 Thierfelder 1970; Narducci 1985, 1539 n. 1.

42 Still indispensable is the repertoire of Virgilian intertexts collected in Thompson/Bruère 1968 and Thompson/Bruère 1970.

43 Narducci 1979, summarized in Narducci 1985, and most clearly reformulated in Narducci 2002, 76-8.

fice, occurs in L.'s *BC* during the preliminaries to the battle at Pharsalus.

A seer prophesies that Rome's 'last day has come' (*uenit summa dies*), for Caesar and Pompey will finally clash with their armies on the fields of Pharsalus.⁴⁴ With a complex allusion to the fall of Troy as foreseen in Hector's speech to his wife Andromache at the Scaean gates, 'the day will come when sacred Troy shall perish,'⁴⁵ L. repeats verbatim the first words spoken by the seer Panthus to Aeneas in *Aeneid* 2.324-5, 'the last day has come (*uenit summa dies*), the unavoidable end for Troy.'⁴⁶ The important difference, however, is that while Virgil and Homer talk of Troy's last days, in L. the last day has come for Rome.⁴⁷ L.'s choice of subject matter, the civil war, is per se anti-Virgilian and anti-epic because the *BC* narrates historical events that are part of a relatively recent and much-feared past rather than distant, mythic events that celebrate the origins of Rome. L. writes historical epic about relatively recent events; but what is historical epic?

The Greeks thought of the *Iliad* as historical epic and the *Aeneid* sings of the transformation of Trojan myth into Roman origins.⁴⁸ Virgil's double scope in the *Aeneid*, as Servius says, is to imitate Homer and celebrate Augustus' divine ancestry,⁴⁹ whereas L. imitates Virgil but his intent seems to have been to denigrate rather than praise. The understanding that epic is a celebratory genre has prevented L.'s early critics from appreciating the *BC*'s approach to the genre. In fact, L. was accused of writing versified history rather than poetry.

Martial's epigram in L.'s defense humorously exemplifies the pragmatic consequences in marketing L.'s *BC* as a poem (Mart. 14.194):

44 *BC* 7.195-6 '*uenit summa dies, geritur res maxima*' dixit | '*in pia concurrunt Pompei et Caesaris arma*.'

45 *Il.* 6.448 ἔσσεται ἡμᾶρ ὅτ' ἄν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρή.

46 Verg. *Aen.* 2.324-5 *uenit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus* | *Dardaniae*. L.'s interest in the Trojan myth, and in the death of Hector as forestalling the ruin of Troy in particular, had probably found an output in his lost *Iliacon*.

47 See Narducci 2002, 81; and Leigh 1997, 6-40, who reconstructs the tradition behind the prophecy uttered at *BC* 7.195-6.

48 Fantham 1992a, 4.

49 Serv. *Aen.* 1.praef.70 *intentio Vergilii haec est, Homerum imitari et Augustum laudare a parentibus*.

Sunt quidam qui me dicant non esse poetam:
sed qui me uendit bybliopola putat.

There are some who say that I am not a poet:
but the bookseller who sells me thinks I am.

The humor in Martial's epigram depends on the fact that even a bookseller, whose interest in reading could be seen as subordinate to his interest in selling, can recognize a poem when he sees one, because the writing is obviously arranged differently on the scroll than in history works; for poets write in verse.

The critique, however, is about whether the topic of civil war is suitable for an epic, as gleaned from the scholiasts, because the *BC* narrative follows too closely the historical events of the first two years of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey (49-8 BCE).⁵⁰

The question, then, revolves not so much on whether the hexameter is at all appropriate for recent war narrative, but on whether the civil war can be the sole topic of an entire epic poem, for such a topic a priori thwarts the genre's celebratory scope, especially when the civil war theme had already been expounded in hexameters.

The pro-Virgilian view, in other words, must have been that there was no need to retrace the horrors of the civil wars after Virgil compressed them so admirably in *Georgics* 1.466-514.⁵¹ The *Aeneid*, too, exploits the theme to some extent. Aeneas' voyage from Troy to Latium is a story of transformation from Trojan to Roman. This transformation was far from painless. After escaping from burning Troy and after many years of wandering on the seas, Aeneas has to face the inhabitants of the fated place where divine will wants the new Troy to rise. Latium is the place, but it does not come free. King Latinus rules there and prince Turnus is to marry the woman who will eventually become Aeneas' wife – which exposes Aeneas to the controversial potentiality of becoming both usurper and adulterer. And as if that were not enough, the war between the Trojans and the Italians narrated in *Aeneid* VII-XII, in other words, can be construed of as civil war, be-

50 The accusation against Lucan not being a poet is echoed by the scholiast in *Comm. Bern.* 1.1 *Lucanus dicitur a plerisque non esse in numero poetarum, quia omnino historiam sequitur, quod poeticae arti non conuenit*; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 1.382 *Lucanus ... ideo in numero poetarum esse non meruit, quia uidetur historiam composuisse, non poema.*

51 Fantham 1992, 7.

cause Turnus' Italians and Aeneas' Trojans share a progeny.⁵² The *Aeneid*, however, remains an epic centered on myth, and while its celebratory intent can certainly be discussed problematically, the apparatus of the genre, with divine interventions and gods and goddesses as characters, is prominent. L.'s choice of topic, by contrast, inevitably undermines the very possibility of epic as celebration because the civil war theme entails, both implicitly and explicitly, an open critique of empire. By L.'s time, the Romans had learned to welcome imperial domination as a matter of Realpolitik, as the necessary price to pay for peace and the end of civil war. The specter of civil discord makes it possible for poets like Virgil and historians like Livy to support the Augustan regime and what we understand as Augustan ideology.

The Augustan regime was the solution to the civil war, and for this reason L. sometimes appears to be a nostalgic republican because of his praise of liberty, but in fact the underlying ideology in L.'s poem is much more nuanced.

Under Nero one could be a nostalgic Republican ideologically, but in practice even L.'s co-conspirators had no illusions. If the Pisonian conspiracy had been successful, Piso would have replaced Nero rather than restoring the Republic. The Republican alternative had already been discarded upon the accession of Claudius after the assassination of Caligula. The militaristic character of the Julio-Claudian dynasty was in fact in the Pretorian guard. They wanted an emperor, and probably needed one in order to survive as a corps. Pretorians and Republic could not coexist. It seems possible, however, that L. had hoped for some degree of Republican liberty (i.e., *libertas senatoria*), in which the Senate would have been able to contribute significantly to government by freely expressing their views and directives as a political body.⁵³

The poem as we have it, however, does not endorse any particular vision. No single character seems to embody the authorial views – whatever they may be. Caesar and Pompey loom large as leaders of the two factions opposed in the war, but it is impossible to identify Pompey with the senatorial liberty cause, at least not before his death in Book

52 Fantham 1992, 6, citing Cairns 1989, 93.

53 The restoration of *libertas senatoria* is what Galba allegedly offered after Nero's assassination in 69 (Tac. *Hist.* 1.16.1-2); Martindale 1984, 71; MacMullen 1966, 28-39; Wirszubski 1950, 136-8.

VIII, when the leadership role is transferred to Cato. The character of Cato unifies the anti-Caesarian opposition but the poem breaks off with the tenth book. The incompleteness of the *BC* on the one hand frustrates a comprehensive interpretation of the poet's ideology and on the other prevents us from evaluating the structure of the poem as a whole.

Book IV and its place in the poem

The question of the formal unity of the *BC* is settled by its topic: the Civil War; but the fact that we are prevented from knowing how the poem ends undermines our appreciation of the poem's structure. In other words, we do not even know whether L. planned to write a total of twelve books or more. I espouse the view that L. intended to write a total of twelve books to end with Cato's death at Utica.⁵⁴ The twelve-book structure is the one that presents the fewest difficulties, and it allows us to articulate the design of the extant narrative in book dyads, triads, tetrads, and eventually in two six-book long halves, just like the *Aeneid*. In order to situate the narrative of Book IV in its appropriate context, it is necessary to provide a brief analysis of Books I-III and to keep in mind that all of the events narrated in Book I-IV (with the exception of the flashbacks into the previous civil wars in Book II) occurred between January and October 49 BCE:

- I: Preliminaries and causes of the war. Caesar crosses the Rubicon: Panic at Rome; Rubicon is crossed on January 10, 49 BCE
- II: Flashback on previous civil wars. Pompey retires to Capua. Domitius is defeated at Corfinium (February 21). Pompey reaches Brundisium and passes into Epirus (March)
- III: Caesar comes to Rome and robs the treasury (April), then crosses the Alps toward Marseille, which his army takes after a siege (April – October)

When the narrative reaches Book IV, Caesar and Pompey have already been presented to the reader. Important events have taken place, but most of the narrative in Books I-III contains dialogues and flashbacks, with the exception of Book III, which is almost entirely filled with the

54 For a discussion of the many scholarly opinions on the poem's structure, see Radicke 2004, 45-81; on the date up to which L. intended to bring his narrative, see Bruère 1950 (= Rutz 1970, 217-56).

war action at Marseille. After Marseille, Book IV opens with a brief pause to describe the nature of the Spanish terrain and the preliminaries to the battle of Ilerda, but whereas Book III has focused on the episode of the siege at Marseille, Book IV is articulated into three plots of unequal length that cover three different theatres of war each with several battles:

- 1-401 Caesar defeats Afranius and Petreius at Ilerda, in Spain
(August – October)
- 402-581 A small contingent of Caesarians in Illyricum kill one another to avoid falling into Pompeian hands
- 581-824 Caesar's legate Curio is defeated in North Africa

After a geographic introduction to the terrain, L. says that on the first day of the Spanish campaign there was no battle. The Spanish campaign, however, is *one* of the several campaigns of the larger war, a *bellum* within a larger *bellum*. L. has called the total of the war *bella plus quam ciuilia* (1.1).

In discussing Book IV, Masters' clever argument surmises how L.'s exordium of the battle narrative as a bloodless, and therefore non-battle kind of event, is purposefully designed to delay the narrative until the appropriate battle narrative of Pharsalus will be allowed to take place (three books later in Book VII)—a technique that allegedly pits Lucan in an anti-Callimachean polemic, for this poem is a big book and makes no attempt to be lighter and shorter, but it conversely grows longer and longer by means of calculated narrative delays (Masters 1992, 53-8). Though superbly informed and sophisticated, Masters' argument is overstated, because what we see at 24 and ff. is a series of ritual moves expected to take place before the battle (see note on 4.24 below).

The comparison with Caesar's narrative in his *BC* is particularly enlightening in appreciating L.'s narrative strategy. The Ilerda narrative is presented by Caesar, *BC* Book I, in two substantial groups of chapters (38-55 and 61-84), separated by two short chapters (59-60), in which Caesar continues the narrative of the Marseille siege (left unfinished in 34-7).⁵⁵ Batstone and Damon have shown how Caesar in the *Civil War* uses 'structure as argument,' as demonstrated by his deliberate abandonment of the annalistic style used in the *Gallic War*, in which

55 After reporting his capture of Sicily and Sardinia (30-3).

each book began and ended with the beginning and the end of the consular year (January-December). Book II of Caesar's *Civil War* begins with the end of the narrative of the siege at Marseilles, while Book I ends with the end of the battle at Ilerda. Book II, in other words, begins with events that happened before those narrated at the end of Book I. Caesar has varied the annalistic structure he used in the *Gallic War* because the events of 49 BCE did not lend themselves to the annalistic treatment. By placing Ilerda at the end of Book I, Caesar can conclude the book with a victorious battle, but he will need to relate the (remaining) facts of Marseille in the following book.⁵⁶

Caesar's purpose in structuring his narrative as described also serves his propaganda, for it obscures Caesar's blatant neglect of established legality in leading his legions to Spain, where as proconsul of Gaul he lacked the necessary legal authority to hold military command (*imperium*) over the Roman legions. L., in fact, has the Pompeians refer to Caesar as a *privatus*, a private citizen, at 4.188, because his command for 49 BCE was as proconsul of Gaul and Illyricum, so his presence as a legion commander in Spain was illegal, a detail understandably unmentioned by Caesar in his *BC*. L. only minimally exploits Caesar's breach of legality in this case, and the reason for this could be that in civil war the respect for legality expectedly becomes a moot point in most cases, but especially when it comes to armies.

What L. does that is conspicuously different from Caesar's narrative is to alter its structure visibly enough to contain the whole narrative of the siege at Marseille within the bounds of Book III and begin Book IV afresh with the Ilerda campaign. The effect of L.'s choice to begin with Ilerda is analogous to Caesar's because both L.'s Book III and Caesar's Book I gain narrative closure by ending with a Caesarian victory. L.'s Book IV, however, ends with Caesarian defeat, that is, with Curio's disastrous campaign in North Africa, and Curio's campaign similarly occupies the final chapters of Caesar's Book II (23-43). Curio's defeat closes the narrative of an important phase of the war, but an obvious difference lies in the absence of the entire episode of Vulteius in Caesar. It has been proposed that the gap in Caesar is accidental, and that originally Caesar included the Vulteius episode in Book II (Caesar's shortest), but it subsequently dropped out as an accident of the

56 Batstone/Damon 2006, 33-88, especially 75-6.

manuscript tradition.⁵⁷ Whether or not this was the case, structurally speaking Caesar's and L.'s narratives are comparably similar in choosing to end a book, and an important phase of the war, with the end of a battle.⁵⁸ In the case of L., furthermore, the end of Book IV as a major narrative turn is marked by an extended apostrophe to dead Curio. L.'s second tetrad ends with the death of Pompey, followed by the poet's apostrophe, and we might imagine that a similar apostrophe might have been reserved to Cato at the end of Book XII had L. lived long enough to complete his poem.

57 Avery 1993.

58 The point of L.'s calculated anti-Caesarian narrative has been exploited with a deconstructionist approach by Henderson 1987 (= Henderson 1998, 165-211); see also Henderson 1996, 262 n. 4 (= Henderson 1998, 38 n. 4). For a healthy (and at times unfair) critique of deconstructionist approaches to L., see Narducci 1999a; Narducci 1999b; Narducci 2002.

III. Language and Style

On L.'s style, one must begin with Quintilian's famous judgment in *Inst.* 10.1.90: *Lucanus ardens et concitatus et sententiis clarissimus et, ut dicam quod sentio, magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus*. Quintilian's *imitandus* naturally means that L. is a model for the orator. The most striking feature of L.'s style is indeed his command of rhetoric. Scholars have repeatedly observed that L. was composing for the declamation house, and that his style therefore presents all the features one would expect to find in a declamation piece, composed hurriedly and meant to be performed with theatrical emphasis: 20th and 21st century readers have little sympathy for such effects.⁵⁹ As the present commentary shows, this poem is to be read slowly and carefully – just the way modern readers (ideally) read it – for L. must have written it with great care.

One of the most striking features of L.'s rhetorical talent is his command of diction and his determination to roam freely across vocabulary registers to impress the audience with audacious *sententiae* and heightened pathos.⁶⁰ For instance, two *sententiae* occurring at close proximity in Curio's hortatory speech to his men before engaging in battle against the Pompeian Varus, aptly exemplify L.'s rhetorical expertise in raising the desired emotions in the audience. *Audax* Curio functions here as a narrative engine to spur his men to action and thus avert the *mora* caused by fear and deliberation: 4.702 *audendo magnus tegitur timor*; 704-5 *uariam semper dant otia mentem. / eripe consilium pugna*.⁶¹

As I hope to have shown in the commentary entries, L.'s language demands careful study. The continued revival of interest in L. has produced a vast bibliography of thought-provoking approaches to the the-

59 Informative summary on L.'s style in Mayer 1981, 10-11.

60 See Quintilian's judgment quoted at the beginning of the present section. The following is chiefly indebted to: Mayer 1981, 10-25; Bramble 1982, 541-2 (in Easterling/Kenney 1982, 533-57); Fantham 1992, 34-46; Gagliardi 1999.

61 Cf. ad loc. and 583n. *audax*.

matic study of the poem,⁶² but the language itself, which is the means whereby the theme of civil war is brought forth, has not received as much attention as it deserves. Our Virgilian taste, however, often causes us to perceive in L. certain inadequacies that perhaps were intended effects, which would have been appreciated as such by contemporary audiences. The present commentary makes the gesture of appreciating L.'s linguistic originality by pointing out how often an individual word, a turn of phrase, or even the most controversially elusive syntactical innovations are first found in L.'s poem.⁶³ While it is always possible that L.'s choices in matters of vocabulary and repetition may be considered faulty by any accredited standards, it is quite impossible, in my view, to name a standard other than what Virgil has chosen for the *Aeneid*. My approach to L.'s style in Book IV, therefore, has been inevitably informed by the Virgilian bias that runs like a crimson thread through the greatest part of Lucanian scholarship, but I will attempt to describe L.'s style (as well as other features of his language in Book IV) as they stand in context.

Diction

L.'s war narrative necessitates the use of military vocabulary, but the prosaic registers also include medical and scientific terminology. Why does L. use such technical vocabulary? The answer is simply that in his poetic descriptions L. desires to achieve the highest level of clinical- and scientific-sounding precision, which he then successfully balances

62 The judgment of taste when it comes to L. starts from the silently implied certitude that Virgil is the standard whereby we must measure any post-Virgilian hexameter poetry. Philip Hardie's path-breaking study on *The Epic Successors of Virgil* illustrates why critics more or less (un-)consciously have read post-classical epic with a pro-Virgilian bias. The acknowledgment that Virgil's *Aeneid* spurs what Hardie terms 'the dynamics of a tradition' should not prevent readers from appreciating the worth of Ovid, Lucan, Silius, Statius, and Valerius, and not only because they are 'all extremely sharp and informative readers of the *Aeneid*' (Hardie 1993, xii), but especially because of their own contributions to the epic genre.

63 Given the copious instances of innovation concerning L.'s language, it is impossible and of dubious usefulness to attempt a complete list of loci. A few examples shall suffice to justify why the commentary silently offers statistics on the occurrence of, e.g., the adverbial *ex facili* at 46; the phrase *uariis motibus* at 49; the metrical pattern exemplified by *sidera caelo* at 54; the use of *aresco* at 55; the pedigree of the squeezed-sky idea at 76; or the local dative *bello*, found only at 44 (see n. ad loc.) and Sil. *Pun.* 13.698-701. See the Index s.v. neologism.

with the fire and brimstone of his rhetoric.⁶⁴ In spite of the obvious necessity of employing technical vocabulary in his poetry, modern critics of L. have consistently looked at the technical flavor of L.'s vocabulary as a stylistic flaw. Having posed the problem of non-poetic vocabulary (however arbitrarily posed, and mostly without defining what poetic vocabulary should consist in), scholars usually point to the non-poetic nature of such registers,⁶⁵ often without offering any criteria at all for their sweeping condemnations. The consensus of Lucanian criticism to explain the abundance of technical vocabulary is haste.⁶⁶ The speed at which L. composed is represented also in the tradition about his extempore performance of the *Orpheus* at the Neronia of 60. In evaluating the *BC*, L.'s haste has often been named for many of the features that are considered sub-standard. Yet in most cases it is not clear at all what standards scholars rely on in evaluating L.'s language. For example, in illustrating vocabulary repetition in 2.209-20, Roland Mayer's complaint is that while the poet tries to avoid repetition by using all the available synonyms for blood, body, and water, 'such words as recur are so colourless that they remain unobtrusive.' Ultimately, Mayer states, L. tries to say 'too much with excessive detail, and his luxuriant imagination is drawing upon an already diminished stock of words.'⁶⁷ Yet the vividness L. achieves with redundancy is definitely intended (see below on periphrasis).

That Latin has fewer words than Greek and is less flexible in adjusting its rhythms to the hexameter is a well-known fact. The abundance of long over short syllables is often cited when discussing the characteristics of the Latin hexameter in comparison to its Greek models. The vocabulary, however, is the very stuff of poetry and what poets do with the words they have at their disposal should be taken, first and foremost, as a reflection of the contemporary taste and linguistic sensibilities. Seen from this perspective, L.'s language looks to me much more effective esthetically than usually seen by scholars precisely be-

64 I owe the phrasing to Michael McOsker.

65 E.g., Bramble 1982, 541: 'Of [L.'s] verbal nouns in *-tor*, which are many, seven of them new, several are unnecessarily [!] prosaic.'

66 Whether fast or slow, L.'s pace of composition has but limited value to our understanding of his poetry, and if any judgment should result from knowing that L. composed very quickly, it should be a positive one.

67 Mayer 1981, 13.

cause of the superabundance of synonyms and the studiously avoided repetitions of single words. The poet's goal in insisting on certain concepts is to exploit in crisp language every single characteristic of what needs to be represented in the hexameter narrative. This inevitably encompasses sound effects and well as sense. When closely examined, L.'s diction is in fact aimed at precision in expressing feelings and pathos and in directing the audience toward specific emotional responses.

An instance in which L. dwells on details to heighten the pathos of a scene occurs at 4.37-43, where the soldiers climbing a hillock are perilously leaning on to the steep slope as well as each other's weaponry. L. varies the subject from 37 *miles* to 38 *acies*, and proceeds to depict the soldiers staring upwards in their frustrated longing for the hill top (*aduersoque acies in monte supina*), while their feet precariously rest on the shields of the soldiers who follow behind. By insisting on conveying with an acceptable degree of precision the actual position of the soldiers, L. exploits all the sense of peril and frustration experienced by these Caesarians in their attempt to take the hillock and in doing so the poet adds a 'zoom out' effect, as it were, by shifting the audience's attention from the individual soldier's struggle to stay put while climbing to the bird-eye perspective that catches the entire army (*acies*).

Insistence on details is a form of repetition, but sometimes L. does repeat words, as for instance he does with the pronoun *tu* in anaphora at 112-13. L. does not use anaphora often, but this is a prayer context, in which L. prays for a deluge that would put an end to the civil war. The striking particularity is that the repeated *tu* first addresses one person, then another. The issues are discussed more fully in the commentary lemmata, but it is worthwhile to mention here one more example of repetition to convey a sense of pathos at 630-1, where with reasonably precise medical terminology L. describes Giant Antaeus being reinvigorated by contact with Earth Mother.⁶⁸

Sometimes L.'s search for an impressive effect will result in the usage of previously unattested vocabulary, which we should see as a welcome feature for L.'s contemporary audience: 66 *fusculator* (hapax); 406 *bellax* (elsewhere only in Silius, see n. below); 1.48 and 415 *flammiger* (also in St. *Theb.* 8.675; *Silvae* 1.2.119, 3.1.181, 4.3.136; Val. Fl. 5.581), 463 *criniger* (Sil. 14.585); 3.299 *supereuolare* (editors prefer

68 On pathos and repetition, see Syndikus 1958, 44-57.

the spelling *super euolare*, which occurs first in Manil. 1.45); 6.126 *confragus* (restored in Naev. *Trag.* 55, but also in St. *Theb.* 4.494 and Val. Fl. 3.582); 223 and 394 *impetere* (Sil. 5.273; St. *Theb.* 8.694), 479 *dimadescere* (hapax), 484 *circumlabi* (hapax, but editors prefer the spelling *circum labentis*), 729 *illatrare* (Sil. 13.845); 7.799 *humator* (hapax); 9.408 *irredux* (hapax), 591 *haustor* (hapax), 941 *hareniuagus* (hapax); 10.286 *celator* (*Exod.* 28.36).⁶⁹

Impressive effects are achieved by L.'s familiarity with an array of linguistic registers that prima facie would seem out of place in an epic poem. In fact, specialized vocabulary is but another aspect not only of declamatory technique but also of erudite poetry, in observance to the scientific interests of the time. For instance in his descriptions of combat L. displays knowledge of medical terminology: e.g., see below ad 4.631 *induruit* (cf. 630-1 and 751). To say 'corpse' he opts for the allegedly prosaic *cadauer* (787), which occurs frequently in L. (see below ad loc.).⁷⁰ He also uses professional military language: 4.780 *globus*,⁷¹ and nautical terms (see Asso 2002 ad 9.319-47).

Far from being 'inadvertent prosy turns',⁷² L.'s special registers and technical vocabulary are unmistakably deliberate and often play the important function of heightening the pathos by achieving contrast with variation.⁷³ A few examples from distinctive vocabulary will show how L. does this.⁷⁴

Compounds such as the rare *semirutus* are particularly evocative, and it is significant that out of three attestations in poetry, two are found in L. (see ad 4.585). The prosaic agent nouns and adjectives in -*tor*, such as *sulcator*, are too frequent (forty-eight times; see below ad 4.588, 722 and 9.496) to be casual incidences; similarly for *cadauer*, occurring thirty-six times. In achieving variety and such deliberate effects, L. also seeks distinction in emulating his predecessors and

69 Fick 1890 lists twenty-seven neologisms but 133 *superenatare* (see 133n. *super emicat* below) is not attested to by the most authoritative MSS (Malcovati 1940, 112-13 n. 2). On L.'s nominal compounds, see Gagliardi 1999 in Esposito/Nicastri 1999, 87-107.

70 Cf. Bramble 1982, 541 n. 3.

71 Fantham 1992, 35.

72 Mayer 1981, 14: "His diction betrays occasional and so perhaps inadvertent prosy turns."

73 The model for diction is rather Virgil than Ovid: Fantham 1992, 36.

74 For a more comprehensive list, see below ad 4.583.

thereby often creates strikingly original expressions, as seen from the many parallels offered in the commentary entries.⁷⁵

Sometimes it is not word choice but rather a certain expression that reveals L.'s desire to impress, as in 4.617 *conseruere... nexu* (cf. 626-9), in a context displaying a variety of wrestling terms (see below ad loc.).

Further features of L.'s diction are more specifically poetic; e.g., the occasional use of nominal compounds: 4.728 *letifer* (also 9.384); 762 *cornipes*; 800 *signifer*; 9.455 *imbrifer*; 478 *sacrificus*.⁷⁶ Also the use of a poetic word may reveal special effects in the context in which it occurs, as 4.750 *sonipes* 'making a sound with its foot', which is precisely what Curio's horses are *not* doing (see below ad loc.).

At 4.4 we encounter the perfectly inoffensive *rector*, but L. has many nouns in *-tor* that are seldom found in other writers. Four are *hapax legomena* in ancient Latin: 10.286 *celator*, 4.66 *fuscatore*, 9.591 *haustor*, and 7.799 *humator*; six are not attested in poetry before L.: 4.214 *adsertor* (only three more times: St. Th. 11.218; Mart. 1.24.3 and 52.3), 9.496 *finitor* (only one more time: St. Th. 8.91), 1.27 and 6.341 *habitor* (six more times: St. Th. 3.604, 4.150, 9.846; S. 3.5.103; Iuv. 14.312), 8.854 and 10.212 *mutator* (two more times: Val. Fl. 6.161 and St. S. 5.2.135), 4.298 and 5.222 *scrutator* (four more times: St. Th. 6.880, 7.720; S. 3.1.84, 3.92), 4.588 *sulcator*; and finally the feminine nouns in *-trix*: 6.426 *altrix*, 9.720 *natrix*, 3.129 *spectatrix*, 6.689 *strix*, 7.782 *ultrix*, 1.3, 128, 339 and 5.238 *uictrix*. Cf. also 4.248 *dissuasor*; 7.402 *fossor*.⁷⁷

L.'s use of prosaic vocabulary, however, is not unique in Latin poetry. As noted at 160 (see below ad loc.) on *anfractus*, also Virgil uses *anfractus* in describing an ambush. Where L. is perhaps even more Virgilian than Virgil is in his use of unusual phrases and in the deployment of enclosing word order and other features of hyperbaton.

75 The commentary entries will offer parallels along with statistics about word usage in previous as well as later authors. The scope of such statistics is to account for L.'s balance in innovative usage and linguistic experimentation.

76 Gagliardi 1999, 106-7.

77 On prosaic diction, see the references collected below at 582n. *exarsit*.

Syntax and Word Order

L. practices ‘*callida iunctura*,’ not always as flashy and noticeable as the oxymoron at 88 *naufraga campo*, or the celebrated 1.98 *concordia discors*. Sometimes an oxymoron speaks to us very directly as 52 *urebant montana niues*, which is made more precious by the rare substantival use of the neuter plural *montana* (see below ad loc.). With his love for driving home a point over and over, L. cannot avoid repetition when a good opportunity presents itself. This is how the notion of a ‘burning cold’ is repeated at 55 *aruerat tellus hiberno dura sereno* (see below ad loc.); see also 305 *siccus... uapores*, where the scientific interests of L. and his audience become relevant. Other times the unusual character of the phrasing is subtle, as in 592 *docuit rudis* (see ad loc.), and yet jarring in spite of the difficulty of spotting the oxymoron feature because of a calculated hyperbaton, as in 607 *auxilio... cadendi*, where the enclosing word order wraps the entire line.

In Book IV the instances of enclosing word order, as a particular effect resulting from the skilful use of hyperbaton, encompass the whole line, or leave out the first word(s), or even extend to more than one line. Here it will suffice to offer a few examples and refer the reader to the index.

The earliest occurrence of enclosing word order embraces two consecutive half lines at 5-6 *in aequas | commune uices*, where the accusative phrase surrounds the already prominent *imperium commune* that begins line 6 and thus adds greater emphasis on the harmony of intent between Afranius and Pompey. This emphasis is all the more significant when we know from Caesar’s narrative that Afranius and Petreius were not always in agreement, as indeed it will be clear inevitably also to L.’s audience when the leaders will differ so clamorously about the option of surrendering to Caesar.

At 62 *suo in nubes quascumque inuenit axe* we find an instance of enclosing word order where the first word of the line has been left out, as also at 140 *medios pontem distendit in agros*, with the bridge in the middle mimetically spanning across the river to join the fields on either bank (see ad loc.). Similarly, at 150 *sed duris fluuium superare lacertis*, Caesar’s soldiers swim the river and ‘embrace’ the current with their arms. The rare instance of the last word of a line left out of the enclosing word order is found at 285 (see ad loc.), but the effect intended is nonetheless mimetic.

Rhetorical devices

L. employs an array of tropes and figures to achieve all sorts of effects. Since he is interested in exploiting as many aspects as possible of a concept, it is best to begin with devices that let the poet repeat words and sounds. **Alliteration** is strictly speaking a poetic rather than a rhetorical feature, but its use naturally produces rhetorical effects because the repeated initial sounds keep the words together and function as an aural sign-posting device for the audience who listens to the poetic performance. The most conspicuous is the alliteration in the voiceless velar *c-* (sometimes varied with the labiovelar *qu-*), which counts at least twenty-four occurrences in Book IV, including a fivefold sequence at 434-5 and three threefold sequences at 158-9, 197, and 822-3.⁷⁸ What alliteration sometimes also achieves is perhaps shown at 822-3 *Cinna cruentus* | *Caesareaque domus series*, where Cinna's bloodiness, denoted by the epithet *cruentus* that syntactically agrees with *Cinna*, carries over to the entire bloodline of the Caesars.

Anaphora is used to maintain pace and mark syntactical units, as at 41-2 and 202-3 *dum*, 64 *quas*, 65-6 *quidquid*, 98 *iam*, 112-13 *tu* (in a prayer; cf. 185-6 in apostrophe), 117-16 *hos*, 110 (in a prayer) and 134-5 *sic*, 119-20 *huc*, 182-3 *quid* (three times in apostrophe), 255-7 *nec* (varied by *non* in 'negative enumeration'; cf. 223-5, 299-302 and 378-80), 300 and 302 *aut* (also to vary a 'negative enumeration'). Anaphora seems particularly appropriate in speeches, where it heightens the pathos and serves demagogic purposes; e.g., Petreius' speech forcing his men to fight and break the fraternizing of the camps at 223-5 *non* (varied with *nulli*); cf. Cato's hortatory speech in Book IX before marching into the desert: 9.387-8 *quibus*; 394-5 *primus*.⁷⁹

78 Given L.'s frequent use of enjambment, with syntactical units that extend over two consecutive lines, my tally includes sequences that continue in the next line: five in *a-* (38, 87, 189, 290, 327, 800-1); twenty-four in *c-* and/or *q-* (17, 20, 32, 148, 148-9, 158-9, 197, 287, 434-5, 437, 459, 487, 462-3, 490, 492-3, 550, 571, 630, 695, 689, 700, 709, 747, 822-3); five in *d-* (28, 129, 154, 217, 813); nine in *f-* (41, 77, 138, 308, 319, 532, 683, 729, 730); one in *g-* (278; perhaps to be counted with the other velar stops); four in *i-* (555, 628, 636-7, 762-3); one in *l-* (45); three in *m-* (312, 773, 778-9); six in *p-* (14, 30, 102, 624, 780, 783); three in *r-* (151, 240, 600); four in *s-* (42, 569, 588, 758); seven in *t-* (273, 432, 631, 702, 767, 768, 818); two in *u-* (80, 590).

79 Similarly, Fantham 1992, 36, draws attention to the use of anaphora and anadiplosis in Cato's self-dedication at 2.309-17.